



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/813,114	03/21/2001	Ola Hugosson	3782-0112P	8104

2292 7590 08/12/2003

BIRCH STEWART KOLASCH & BIRCH
PO BOX 747
FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747

EXAMINER

SHENG, TOM V

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2673

DATE MAILED: 08/12/2003

10

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/813,114

Applicant(s)

HUGOSSON ET AL.

Examiner

Tom V Sheng

Art Unit

2673

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-35 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5, 10-16, 19, 20, 22, 24, 25, 27-29 and 31-34 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 6-9, 17, 18, 21, 23, 26, 30 and 35 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on ____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). ____.
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) ____ 6) ☐ Other: ____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

1. Claim 18 is objected to because of the following informalities: the phrase "as claimed in claim 15 further comprising" is missing in the current amendment.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-5, 10-16, 19-20, 22, 24-25, 27-29 and 31-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sekendur (US Patent 5852434) and Kuzunuki (US Patent 5903667).

As to claim 1, Sekendur teaches a product for electronic transmission of handwritten information, comprising: at least one writing area for the handwritten information (figure 1; writing surface such as paper), wherein the writing area comprises a position-coding pattern (systematically coded with a plurality of dots 1) comprising a plurality of first symbols (dots 1) and wherein an arbitrary position area (figure 3; any dot 1) of a predetermined first size (size of dot 1) of the position-coding pattern unambiguously defines a position (designating an X-Y coordinate) on the product (figure

2; this is achieved by coding each dot with different combination of dark and light slices structured by concentric circles and quadrants; column 5, lines 1-46).

Sekendur does not teach an address area indicating an address to which the handwritten information is to be sent, wherein the address area comprises an address-coding pattern comprising a plurality of second symbols and wherein an arbitrary address portion of a predetermined second size of the address-coding pattern unambiguously defines part of the address.

Kusunuki teaches a formatted mail document (figure 2) comprising receiver input area G130, transmitter input area G150, item input area G170, and contents input area G190. These areas are to be inputted as handwritten characters and recognized as such. See column 1, lines 52-67. Furthermore, Kusunuki teaches that data handwritten in transmitter area G150 would be used for transferring the data handwritten in the comment area G210 (figure 3; column 2, lines 1-18). Kusunuki's transmitter area reads on claimed address area.

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide a transmitter area for transferring the information in the position-coded writing area, because this allows handwritten information transfer as taught by Kusunuki, which is like a form of electronic faxing. Further, it is obvious that the same coding format as in Sekendur can also be used for the transmitter (address) area for address decoding purpose.

As to claims 2, 10, since Sekendur/Kusunuki's content area and transmitter area serve different purposes, it does not matter on the size difference between the first size

of the arbitrary position area of the position-coding pattern and the second size of the arbitrary address portion of the address-coding pattern. This similarly applies to the sizes of the first symbols and the second symbols.

As to claim 3, Kusunuki teaches that the input in the transmitter area is a handwritten character and is recognized as such.

As to claim 4, a computer or computer network is obviously used for transmission of handwritten information.

As to claim 5, Sekendur/Kusunuki's content and transmitter would both define coordinates and are parts of a larger virtual code area (the entire writing surface of a paper).

As to claim 11, the mere interspace difference does not make it patentively distinct, especially when the two patterns separate from each other.

As to claim 12, the further defining of a public key for address decoding is not patentively distinct. It is merely a security feature.

As to claims 13 and 14, the designation of separate code fields merely simplifies the character decoding.

Claim 15 differs from claim 1 in that an apparatus for electronic transmitting handwritten information comprising a reading head, a memory, means for converting recorded image to at least one position, means for converting recorded image to at least one character, and means for transmitting the positions to an address associated with the characters. As analyzed in claim 1, Sekendur/Kusunuki teaches transmitting information written in the content area to an address indicated by the transmitter area.

Art Unit: 2673

Moreover, Sekendur teaches a self-contained scanning stylus (figure 7) comprising a reading head adapted to optically record images from the surface (CCD 13); a memory (part of microcomputer 21); means for converting to positions, characters representing an address, and transmitting the positions to the address (analyzed with claim 1's rejection). It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use Sekendur's scanning stylus in Sekendur/Kuzunuki in order to facilitate convenient electronic faxing.

As to claim 16, Sekendur teaches the claimed pen point (figure 7; writing element 9 with a pressure sensitive on/off switch 10).

As to claim 19, the mere extra feature of transmitting an identification number is not patentively distinct.

Claim 20 is rejected per analysis of claim 15.

Claim 22 is rejected per analysis of claim 1.

As to claims 24-25, 27-28 and 33-34, the reading head of Sekendur is arbitrarily positioned in scanning.

As to claim 29, apparently a calculation is involved in converting from image to a decoded character.

Claims 31 and 32 are rejected per analysis of claim 1.

Allowable Subject Matter

4. Claims 6-9, 17-18, 21, 23, 26, 30 and 35 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: none of the prior arts of record teaches the recitations "the address-coding pattern comprises a plurality of sequence portions based on the plurality of second symbols and wherein the arbitrary address portion that is required to define part of the address comprises a predetermined number of sequence portions of a predetermined length" of claim 6, "means for converting a first part of characters stored in the memory to an address and a second part of characters stored in the memory to position information which defines a writing area; and means for transmitting only positions contained in the writing area to the address" of claim 17, "means for converting recorded images of the address-coding pattern to a set of sequence portions, converting the set of sequence portions to a set of sequence values, and converting the sequence values to characters based on information stored in the memory" of claim 18, "converting part of the stored characters to writing position information that defines a writing area, and transmitting only positions contained in the writing area to the address" of claim 21, "said position on the product has a resolution smaller than the size of the arbitrary position area" of claims 23, "the position on the surface has a resolution smaller than the size of the arbitrary position area" of claims 26, 30 and 35.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-22 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tom V Sheng whose telephone number is (703) 305-6708. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30am - 5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bipin Shalwala can be reached on (703) 305-4938. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 872-9314 for regular communications and (703) 872-9314 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.


KENT CHANG
PRIMARY EXAMINER

TS
August 5, 2003